DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 110 EC 304 395

AUTHOR	Davis, Sharon
TITLE	Report Card on Inclusion in Education of Students with Mental Retardation, 1995.
INSTITUTION	Arc, Arlington, TX.
PUB DATE	Oct 95
NOTE	30p.; For earlier "report cards," see ED 352 778 and ED 378 760.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Arc, 500 E. Border Street, Suite 300, Arlington, TX 76010 ($4).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Advocacy; Compliance (Legal); Data Analysis; Educational Legislation; Educational Quality; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; Government Role; *Inclusive Schools; Mainstreaming; *Mental Retardation; State Programs; *Student Placement; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Arc (Association for Retarded Citizens); Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates progress in including children with mental retardation in integrated educational environments and provides detailed tables providing state-by-state comparisons. A prologue by the executive director of The Arc, a national organization on mental retardation, notes that, for children with mental retardation, placement in segregated educational environments continues to be the rule of the land, with only 7.1 percent of such children receiving their education in regular classrooms during 1992-93, up only slightly from the 6.7 percent reported during 1989-90. A large discrepancy between integration data for children with other disabilities and children with mental retardation is noted. Vermont is presented as an example of the successful implementation of inclusion of children with mental retardation. Concerns of The Arc regarding reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act are noted, such as proposals regarding easing of requirements to educate all children and elimination of categorization of disability. The main body of the report has sections which address: principles of inclusion in education affirmed by The Arc; benefits of inclusion; educational environments of children with mental retardation; national changes in educational placements; state-by-state comparison of the use of regular classroom placements; changes in the use of regular classrooms; state comparison of combined regular class and resource room placement; state comparison of overall use of inclusive settings for children with mental retardation; "report card grades" for each state; an overview of findings; limitations of the data; the quality of education received by children with mental retardation; and renewal of The Arc's call to action by the federal government, state governments, local school systems, and chapters of The Arc. (Contains 15 references.) (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 389 110

The Arc

a national organization on mental retardation

1995 REPORT CARD ON INCLUSION IN EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION

by

Sharon Davis, Ph.D.
Director, The Arc's
Department of Research and Program Services

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S.A. DAVIS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC304395

October 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With Assistance From:

Brenda Doss, Co-Chair, Program Services and Research Committee
Karen Staley, Chairperson, Communications/Marketing Committee
Alan Abeson, Ed.D., Executive Director, The Arc of the United States
Paul Marchand, Director, Governmental Affairs
Rick Berkobien, Assistant Director, Research and Program Services
Michael Wehmeyer, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Research and Program Services

National Headquarters
500 E. Border St., S-300
Arlington, Texas 76010
(817) 261-6003
TDD (817) 277-0553
Email: thearc@metronet.com

PROLOGUE

COMMENTARY ON THE ARC'S

1995 REPORT CARD ON INCLUSION IN EDUCATION

ALAN ABESON, ED.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE ARC.

On the eve of the 20th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, The Arc is extremely disappointed to issue this report verifying that for children with mental retardation, placement in segregated educational environments continues to be the rule of the land. Tragically, only 7.1 percent of children with mental retardation were receiving their education in regular classrooms in the school year 1992-93, the most recent year reported. Especially disturbing is that these findings reveal substantial noncompliance with this law that requires that children with disabilities be educated with children who are not disabled to the maximum extent appropriate and that removal from regular educational settings should occur only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in those classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

When The Arc issued its first report on inclusion in education based on school year 1989-90 data, 6.7 percent of children with mental retardation were being educated in regular classes. Some critics said the data was too old, and that looking at it a few years later would document much progress in terms of placing children with mental retardation in inclusive settings. This report, however, reveals that with an improvement of less than one half of one percentage point (.4%), there has been virtually no progress.

Fortunately for all other children with disabilities, there has been progress. The percentage of these children placed in regular classes went from 35.3 percent in 1989-90 to 44.0 percent in 1992-93, an increase of about 9 percentage points.

Unfortunately, when data regarding placement is discussed by the federal government, state agencies and others, children with all disabilities typically are grouped together. Such data blurs the great discrepancy that has and continues to

exist between children with mental retardation and most other children with disabilities. As a result, the problem for the children and families for whom The Arc advocates becomes invisible.

So, while The Arc praises the inclusive efforts of state and local agencies regarding other children with disabilities, it must question these agencies' effort and commitment to place and support children with mental retardation in regular education settings. The fact is that children with mental retardation are six times less likely to be placed in a regular classroom than their peers with other disabilities.

Combining the percentage of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms with those placed in resource rooms does not significantly improve the outlook. In 1992-93, 34 percent of children with mental retardation were in these two settings, compared to 76 percent of children with all other disabilities. The data is clear. Fully 66 percent of students with mental retardation are educated in totally segregated settings.

Incredibly, despite much evidence to the contrary, there appears to be a general misperception by public education agencies that children with any level of cognitive disability require a segregated educational placement. Thankfully, there are pockets of hope in the country, where administrators, teachers, parents and students have taken the initiative to challenge the status quo of inaction and noncompliance with IDEA.

Vermont, which provides 75 percent of the children with mental retardation in its state with education in the regular classroom, offers substantial evidence that inclusion can be successfully implemented. Unfortunately, this is the exception, not the rule. Almost half of the states educated fewer than 5 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms.

With this significant law up for reauthorization in Congress, The Arc is concerned about the possibility that changes may further threaten the opportunities for children with mental retardation to receive inclusive education and erode what little progress has been made in IDEA's 20-year history. One example is the potential easing of requirements that insure that children with mental retardation and all other disabilities as well, who because of their disabilities present some educational

challenges, such as occasional disruptive behavior, are assured of ongoing school attendance. Such a weakening of the policy would place these children out of school at home and on the street, precisely the outcome that the framers of the Federal law chose to remedy.

The Arc is also concerned about a proposal which will eliminate categorization of disability. While it is not advantageous to label children with terms that become stigmatizing, without recognition of the presence of the disability, advocates for children with mental retardation would have no way of adequately monitoring the states' progress in educating them, placing them in inclusive settings and allocating resources intended to provide them with specialized assistance. Given the dismal record presented in this report, The Arc believes the nation must have the ability to continue monitoring educational opportunities for these children.

Children with mental retardation who are being denied their right to an education in the least restrictive environment, are sadly the victims of gross negligence by local, state and federal education agencies. Denying these children the opportunity to learn with and from their nondisabled peers and vice versa is truly a loss for all children and ultimately the nation. Readers of this report, all people involved with The Arc and others throughout the country concerned with the education of all children must make themselves aware of the performance of the schools in their neighborhoods, communities and states, praising those doing well at including children with mental retardation and directly challenging those that are not.

1995 Report Card on Inclusion in Education of Children with Mental Retardation

In 1992, The Arc, a national organization on mental retardation, issued a Report Card to the Nation on Inclusion in Education of Students with Mental Retardation (Davis, 1992). Describing the generally dismal record of most states in providing an inclusive education for children with mental retardation, The Arc issued a call to action urging the federal government, state governments and advocacy organizations, including chapters of The Arc, to achieve full inclusion of children with mental retardation by the Year 2000. As an interim goal for 1995, The Arc called for the nation's schools to be educating at least 50 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms by 1995.

For twenty years, federal policy (Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - IDEA), has required school districts to consider placing a child with disabilities in a regular classroom setting with the use of supplementary aids and services before exploring other more restrictive alternatives. The law also requires that alternative placements be available to meet the individual needs of a child when they cannot be met in the regular classroom. Through the years, schools have interpreted the law to mean that segregated settings such as separate classrooms and separate schools are appropriate placements for children with mental retardation.

This misconception continues today on the twentieth anniversary of IDEA. The latest information available reveals that in the 1992-93 school year, 7.1 percent of children with mental retardation were educated in regular classrooms. The nation will have had to move quickly to reach The Arc's goal of 50 percent of children with mental retardation placed in regular classrooms by the 1995 school year. Because of the time gap between data collection and reporting the findings, it will be two years before The Arc's 1995 interim goal can be measured.

What is Inclusion in Education?

Inclusion is defined as "the provision of services to students with disabilities, including those with severe disabilities, in their neighborhood schools, in age-appropriate regular education classes, with the necessary support services and supplementary aids--for both children and teachers. The goal of inclusion is to prepare students to participate as full and contributing members of society. Inclusion means meeting the law's requirement of a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (Lipsky and Gartner, 1994, p.36)."

The Arc, in its 1990 position on education, affirmed some basic principles that reflect the association's beliefs regarding the inclusion of students with mental retardation (The Arc, 1994). These principles include:

- Preparation for life in the community best occurs when all students of different backgrounds and abilities learn and socialize together in classrooms and other school settings where all have a chance to achieve and receive instruction designed to develop and enhance successful living within the community.
- Each student with a disability belongs in an age appropriate classroom with peers who are not disabled.
- Each student has the right to receive individualized education which provides choices, meets the student's needs, and offers the necessary support.
- All students should receive instruction which facilitates an understanding and acceptance of human differences.
- Each student should have the opportunity to follow the same daily schedule as followed by all students in their neighborhood schools.
- Each student should have the opportunity to participate in recreation and extracurricular activities with appropriate support and supervision by school personnel.
- Each student should be encouraged and supported toward developing meaningful social interaction and friendships with other students.

Inclusion refers to the opportunity for all students to participate in the totality of the school experience. In an inclusive school system, special education and related support services are provided in typical school settings. Children are integrated into regular classrooms for both educational and social opportunities. Children with mental retardation have access to the subjects taught in the regular curriculum with the necessary support provided for learning. More than this, however, it means students with mental retardation participate in or attend extracurricular activities such as sports and school plays, eat and socialize with peers in the school lunchroom, and engage in other school activities from which they are often excluded.

Benefits of Inclusion

Advocates have long noted that inclusion benefits both children with disabilities and children who are not disabled. In recent years, research has begun to document these benefits. Selected examples of research findings supporting inclusion in education include:

- Students with significant disabilities had greater success in achieving IEP goals than did matched students in traditional programs (Ferguson, et al, 1992).
- Special needs students educated in regular classes do better academically and socially than comparable students in noninclusive settings (Baker, Wang & Walberg, 1994).
- For students with disabilities, gains occurred in self-esteem (Burello & Wright, 1993), acceptance by classmates (Marwell, 1990, Christmas, 1992) and social skills (McDonnell, McDonnell, Hardman & McCune, 1991).
- The academic progress of nondisabled students was not slowed down by having students with disabilities in their classrooms (Staub & Peck).
- Nondisabled students benefited from inclusion as follows: 1) reduced fear of human differences accompanied by increased comfort and awareness; 2) growth in social cognition; 3) improvement in self-concept; 4) development of personal principles; and 5) warm and caring friendships (Staub & Peck).

- Parents confirmed improved outcomes for their children who did not have disabilities when children with severe disabilities were included in the classroom (Giangreco, Edelman, Cloniger & Dennis, 1992).
- Teachers and administrators perceived integrated students with moderate disabilities to have increased independence and improved functional skills. Social benefits to integrated students with disabilities included acquiring age-appropriate behaviors and tastes, developing friendships and increased self-esteem. Students without disabilities were perceived to have grown in their self-esteem and in their acceptance of individual differences (Janney, Snell, Beers & Rayners, 1995).

Educational Environments of Children with Mental Retardation

In order to determine the extent to which children with mental retardation are educated in inclusive settings, The Arc analyzed data on educational placements of children with mental retardation as reported in the annual reports to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

When reporting to the federal government, states must classify student placements according to six different educational environments (U.S. Department of Education, 1995). They are defined below, starting with the most inclusive setting (the regular classroom) and ending with the least inclusive setting (homebound or hospitalized).

> *Regular class* includes students who receive the majority of their education program in a regular classroom and receive special education and related services outside the regular classroom for less than 21 percent of the school day. It includes children placed in a regular class who receive special education within the regular class, as well as children placed in a regular class who receive special education outside the regular class.
>
> *Resource room* includes students who receive special education and related services outside the regular classroom for at least 21 percent but no more than 60 percent of the school day. This may include students placed in resource rooms with special education/related services provided within the resource room, or placed in resource rooms with part-time instruction in a regular class.

Separate class includes students who receive special education and related services outside the regular classroom for more than 60 percent of the school day. Students may be placed in self-contained special classrooms with part-time instruction in regular classes or placed in self-contained classes full time on a regular school campus.

Separate school includes students who receive special education and related services in private and public separate day schools for students with disabilities for more than 50 percent of the school day.

Residential facility includes students who receive education in a public or private residential facility, at public expense, for more than 50 percent of the school day.

Homebound/hospital environment includes students placed in and receiving special education in hospital or homebound programs.

National Changes in Educational Placements

Table 1 displays national data on the percentage of students with mental retardation and the percentage of students with all other disabilities placed in each educational environment in school years 1989-90 and 1992-93 (U.S. Department of Education, 1992 and 1995). These figures represent 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Students Placed in Different Educational Environments (1989-90 and 1992-93).

Environment	Students With Mental Retardation		Students With All Other Disabilities	
	1989-90	1992-93	1989-90	1992-93
Regular Class	6.7	7.1	35.3	44.0
Resource Room	20.1	26.8	40.2	32.3
Separate Class	61.1	56.8	19.4	19.2
Separate School	10.3	7.9	3.7	3.1
Residential Facility	1.4	.8	.9	.8
Home/Hospital	.4	.5	.6	.5

In 1992-93, only 7.1 percent of children with mental retardation were in regular classrooms. In three years, there has been an increase of less than 1 percentage point (0.4%), from 6.7% in 1989-90 to 7.1% in 1992-93. All other children with disabilities show an increase of 9 percentage points over the three year period, as 44 percent were placed in regular classes in 1992-93. Children with mental retardation were 6 times less likely to receive their education in a regular classroom than children with all other disabilities.

Combining children placed in resource rooms with children placed in regular classrooms reveals that 34 percent of children with mental retardation and 76 percent of children with all other disabilities were educated in the two most inclusive settings. While there was very little increase in use of the regular classroom for students with mental retardation, there was a nearly 7 percentage point increase in use of the resource room in 1992-93.

In 1989-90, 73 percent of students with mental retardation were in segregated settings (separate class, separate day school, separate residential facility) compared with 24 percent of students with all other disabilities. In 1992-93, 66 percent of children with mental retardation still remained in segregated educational environments, compared with the one-fourth of children with other disabilities. If the resource room is considered inclusive (and that is open to debate), there has been slight improvement for children with mental retardation. In 1992-93, 57 percent of children with mental retardation received their education in separate classrooms, 8 percent in separate day schools and about 1 percent in residential facilities. Less than 1 percent were in homebound/hospital settings.

Overall, improvement in use of inclusive settings for children with mental retardation has been extremely modest. The increase in percentage placed in regular classrooms improved 0.4 percentage point. The use of the resource room increased 7 percentage points. More encouraging is the decrease from 1989-90 to 1992-93 in use of separate schools and residential facilities of 3 percentage points from 11.7 percent to 8.7 percent.

State by State Comparison on Use of Regular Classroom

Table 2 illustrates the percentage of students placed in regular classrooms by individual states during the 1989-90 and 1992-93 school years. States are ranked on 1992-93 percentages from most to least use of regular classroom. For comparison, the 1989-90 ranking of individual states is also included.

Vermont leads the states in 1992-93 with 75 percent of students with mental retardation placed in regular classrooms. It is followed by Montana, 25 percent; Texas, 25 percent; Idaho, 24 percent; New Hampshire, 22 percent; and Massachusetts, 21 percent. Each of these states placed more than 20 percent of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms. Vermont, Massachusetts, Idaho and New Hampshire were in the top six in 1989-90, whereas Texas and Montana are newcomers to the top of the ranking.

At the bottom of the list is New Jersey, followed by Illinois and Iowa with fewer than 1 percent of children with mental retardation placed in regular classrooms. West Virginia, Arizona, District of Columbia, Louisiana, Puerto Rico and Nevada educate fewer than 2 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classes. New York, Georgia and Indiana, the bottom three states in 1989-90 have shown considerable progress, moving up to 23rd, 19th and 27th respectively. West Virginia and Nevada have declined sufficiently in use of regular classrooms to join the bottom nine. New Jersey, Illinois, Iowa, Arizona, District of Columbia, Louisiana and Puerto Rico have shown little change.

Changes in Use of Regular Classrooms

Table 3 shows the percentage points of change for each state from 1989-90 to 1992-93 on use of regular classrooms and ranks them from high (positive change) to low (negative change). Texas leads the states in the percentage increase of students served in regular classrooms. It increased from fewer than 2 percent in 1989-90 to almost 25 percent in 1992-93, an increase of 23 percentage points. Vermont was close behind with an increase of 21 percent. However, Vermont went from 54 percent to 75 percent served in regular classrooms, which is an exceptional increase considering the

TABLE 2

State Ranking on Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Age 6-21 Served in Regular Classes During School Years 1989-90 and 1992-93.

1989-90 Rank	1992-93 Rank	State	1989 - 90 Percentage	1992 - 93 Percentage
2	1	Vermont	54.06	74.70
15	2	Montana	7.79	24.66
37	3	Texas	1.62	24.59
5	4	Idaho	18.50	23.73
4	5	New Hampshire	25.22	22.07
1	6	Massachusetts	59.25	21.10
16	7	Oregon	7.19	17.76
6	8	Nebraska	15.5	17.06
10	9	Washington	8.14	16.57
13	10	No. Dakota	7.94	16.42
38	11	So. Dakota	1.48	16.01
31	12	Minnesota	2.95	15.26
18	13	Kentucky	6.20	13.00
8	14	No. Carolina	11.53	10.58
14	15	Oklahoma	7.85	9.76
29	16	New Mexico	3.18	9.24
7	17	Arkansas	11.54	9.06
11	18	Alabama	8.10	8.59
51	19	Georgia	0.27	8.44
20	20	Alaska	5.76	7.54
9	21	Maine	8.41	7.37
26	22	Delaware	4.83	6.95
52	23	New York	0.26	6.86
19	24	Michigan	6.13	6.62
12	25	Tennessee	7.97	6.54
36	26	Hawaii	1.75	6.22
50	27	Indiana	0.30	6.13
22	28	Kansas	5.29	5.10
27	29	Maryland	3.58	4.99
3	30	Wyoming	36.02	4.32
35	31	Colorado	2.18	4.15
44	32	Mississippi	0.82	3.77
23	33	So. Carolina	5.27	3.75
17	34	Utah	6.25	3.68
28	35	Wisconsin	3.38	3.25
32	36	Connecticut	2.50	3.08
40	37	Pennsylvania	1.37	2.81
46	38	Florida	0.58	2.73
24	39	Missouri	5.17	2.72
30	40	California	3.16	2.61
34	41	Ohio	2.25	2.52
33	42	Virginia	2.32	2.51
41	43	Rhode Island	1.36	2.03
21	44	Nevada	5.31	1.79
42	45	Puerto Rico	1.34	1.77
39	46	Louisiana	1.39	1.56
45	47	D.C.	0.75	1.50
43	48	Arizona	1.26	1.39
25	49	W. Virginia	4.97	1.07
48	50	Iowa	0.33	0.80
49	51	Illinois	0.31	0.76
47	52	N. Jersey	0.51	0.28

TABLE 3

State Ranking on Improvement in Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Served in Regular Classes During School Years 1989-90 and 1992-93.

Rank	State	1992-93 Percentage	1989-90 Percentage	Change
1	Texas	24.59	1.62	22.97
2	Vermont	74.70	54.06	20.64
3	Montana	24.66	7.79	16.87
4	S. Dakota	16.01	1.48	14.53
5	Minnesota	15.26	2.95	12.31
6	Oregon	17.76	7.19	10.57
7	N. Dakota	16.42	7.94	8.48
8	Washington	16.57	8.14	8.43
9	Georgia	8.44	0.27	8.17
10	Kentucky	13.00	6.2	6.80
11	New York	6.86	0.26	6.60
12	New Mexico	9.24	3.18	6.06
13	Indiana	6.13	0.30	5.83
14	Idaho	23.73	18.5	5.23
15	Hawaii	6.22	1.75	4.47
16	Mississippi	3.77	0.82	2.95
17	Florida	2.73	0.58	2.15
18	Delaware	6.95	4.83	2.12
19	Colorado	4.15	2.18	1.97
20	Oklahoma	9.76	7.85	1.91
21	Alaska	7.54	5.76	1.78
22	Nebraska	17.06	15.5	1.56
23	Pennsylvania	2.81	1.37	1.44
24	Maryland	4.99	3.58	1.41
25	D.C.	1.50	0.75	0.75
26	Rhode Island	2.03	1.36	0.67
27	Connecticut	3.08	2.50	0.58
28	Alabama	8.59	8.10	0.49
29	Michigan	6.62	6.13	0.49
30	Iowa	0.80	0.33	0.47
31	Illinois	0.76	0.31	0.45
32	Puerto Rico	1.77	1.34	0.43
33	Ohio	2.52	2.25	0.27
34	Virginia	2.51	2.32	0.19
35	Louisiana	1.56	1.39	0.17
36	Arizona	1.39	1.26	0.13
37	Wisconsin	3.25	3.38	-0.13
38	Kansas	5.10	5.29	-0.19
39	N. Jersey	0.28	0.51	-0.23
40	California	2.61	3.16	-0.55
41	N. Carolina	10.58	11.53	-0.95
42	Maine	7.37	8.41	-1.04
43	Tennessee	6.54	7.97	-1.43
44	S. Carolina	3.75	5.27	-1.52
45	Missouri	2.72	5.17	-2.45
46	Arkansas	9.06	11.54	-2.48
47	Utah	3.68	6.25	-2.57
48	N. Hampshire	22.07	25.22	-3.15
49	Nevada	1.79	5.31	-3.52
50	W. Virginia	1.07	4.97	-3.90
51	Wyoming	4.32	36.02	-31.70
52	Massachusetts	21.10	59.25	-38.15

state was already placing such a high percentage in regular classes. Montana is in third position, followed by South Dakota, Minnesota and Oregon, all with increases in percentage served in regular classrooms of more than 10 percent.

Sixteen states showed reduced percentages of children served in regular classrooms from 1989-90 to 1992-93. Since Massachusetts changed the formula by which it collects data, the earlier figure cannot be fairly compared with the current percentage. With the exception of Wyoming, the decreases in the remaining 14 states were under four percentage points. The aggregate data for all states show an increase of only 0.4 percentage points from 1989-90 to 1992-93. Thirty-two states showed increases from this mean.

State Comparison on Combined Regular Class and Resource Room Placement

Because a resource room placement in some schools means that students are based in a regular classroom for part of the day and are in a more inclusive setting, the data on children served in resource room settings is combined with data on percent of children in regular classrooms in Table 4. States are ranked on the basis of total percentage of students served in these two settings.

Vermont still leads the states with a combined total of 80 percent of children with mental retardation provided their education in these two settings. Ten states follow with combined percentages above 50 percent. These are Texas, Kentucky, Iowa, Idaho, Ohio, South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Arkansas and Nebraska.

At the bottom of the list is New Jersey with 2 percent of children in these two settings, followed by Illinois, the District of Columbia, Rhode Island, Louisiana and Florida, all serving fewer than 10 percent in resource rooms and regular classes. These six states thus head the list of those using the most segregated settings for students with mental retardation.

TABLE 4

State Ranking on Total Percentage of Students with Mental Retardation Served in Regular Classes and Resource Rooms Combined - 1992-93

Rank	State	Regular Class	Resource Room	Total
1	Vermont	74.70	5.72	80.42
2	Texas	24.59	45.03	69.62
3	Kentucky	13.00	55.10	68.10
4	Iowa	0.80	64.02	64.82
5	Idaho	23.73	36.71	60.44
6	Ohio	2.52	57.80	60.32
7	S. Dakota	16.01	42.10	58.11
8	Minnesota	15.26	42.08	57.34
9	Montana	24.66	30.72	55.38
10	Arkansas	9.06	45.90	54.96
11	Nebraska	17.06	37.66	54.72
12	Washington	16.57	32.66	49.23
13	Massachusetts	21.10	22.77	43.87
14	Oklahoma	9.76	34.07	43.83
15	N. Carolina	10.58	33.21	43.79
16	Maine	7.37	34.87	42.24
17	Oregon	17.76	23.74	41.50
18	Wyoming	4.32	35.98	40.30
19	N. Dakota	16.42	23.02	39.44
20	Puerto Rico	1.77	37.42	39.19
21	N. Hampshire	22.07	17.02	39.09
22	Colorado	4.15	34.26	38.41
23	Tennessee	6.54	30.02	36.56
24	Georgia	8.44	26.33	34.77
25	Alaska	7.54	26.94	34.48
26	S. Carolina	3.75	29.44	33.19
27	Alabama	8.59	24.55	33.14
28	Wisconsin	3.25	28.33	31.58
29	W. Virginia	1.07	30.02	31.09
30	Kansas	5.10	23.38	28.48
31	N. Mexico	9.24	18.99	28.23
32	Hawaii	6.22	21.51	27.73
33	Delaware	6.95	20.41	27.36
34	Pennsylvania	2.81	22.54	25.35
35	Michigan	6.62	17.83	24.45
36	Virginia	2.51	21.23	23.74
37	Nevada	1.79	21.26	23.05
38	Connecticut	3.08	16.72	19.80
39	Utah	3.68	14.87	18.55
40	Missouri	2.72	14.92	17.64
41	Mississippi	3.77	11.21	14.98
42	New York	6.86	7.68	14.54
43	Arizona	1.39	12.74	14.13
44	Maryland	4.99	7.87	12.86
45	Indiana	6.13	6.40	12.53
46	California	2.61	9.43	12.04
47	Florida	2.73	5.53	8.26
48	Louisiana	1.56	5.89	7.45
49	Rhode Island	2.03	3.68	5.71
50	D.C.	1.50	3.96	5.46
51	Illinois	0.76	3.58	4.34
52	N. Jersey	0.28	1.84	2.12

State Comparison in Overall Use of Inclusive Settings for Children with Mental Retardation

Because states vary tremendously in their use of different educational environments for students with mental retardation, The Arc devised a formula for weighting different placements in order to compare states on the inclusiveness of the settings in which they educate these children. Children placed in the most inclusive setting, regular class, are assigned a weight of 4; those placed in the resource room are assigned a weight of 2; those in separate classes a weight of 1; and those in separate schools which not at all inclusive are assigned a weight of 0. Using these weights, an inclusion score is calculated for each state. These are exhibited in Table 5 for 1989-90 and 1992-93. States are ranked from the most inclusive to the least inclusive on this score in 1992-93 and are assigned grades.

Vermont has the highest inclusion score in 1992-93, followed by Texas, Idaho, Montana, Kentucky and Nebraska. New Jersey has the lowest score, followed by the District of Columbia, Illinois, Rhode Island, Florida and Maryland.

Several factors result in high inclusion scores. In Vermont's case, it clearly leads the nation because it places a much higher percentage of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms than any other state. Seventy-five percent receive their education in this setting. This percentage is three times higher than the percentage served in regular classrooms by Texas, Idaho and Montana, the next highest ranked states. Another factor resulting in a higher inclusion score for a state is the extensive use of the resource room as the educational environment. Texas and Kentucky are two states in the top six that have high percentages of students served in resource rooms. This also affects the inclusion scores of states such as Ohio and Iowa who place few students in regular classrooms, but large numbers in resource rooms. States with lower inclusion scores make much greater use of separate classroom and separate school placements.

The states' scores for 1992-93 were compared with those for 1989-90 to identify any changes. The bottom eight states remain at the bottom. Vermont remains at the top, as Massachusetts acknowledged its data in 1989-90 school year was based on an

TABLE 5

State Ranking on Inclusion Score and Grade

1989-90 Rank	1992-93 Rank	State	1989 - 90 Inclusion Score	1992-93 Inclusion Score	1992-93 Grade
2	1	Vermont	2.68	3.29	B
39	2	Texas	1.07	2.16	D
4	3	Idaho	1.84	2.05	D
17	4	Montana	1.43	2.05	D
8	5	Kentucky	1.71	1.93	D
7	6	Nebraska	1.71	1.85	D
15	7	Washington	1.51	1.82	D
13	8	S. Dakota	1.55	1.81	D
1	9	Massachusetts	2.88	1.81	D
16	10	Minnesota	1.45	1.78	D
21	11	Oregon	1.40	1.76	D
5	12	New Hampshire	1.72	1.72	D
22	13	N. Dakota	1.38	1.70	D
6	14	Arkansas	1.71	1.68	D
10	15	Iowa	1.59	1.64	D
36	16	Ohio	1.11	1.63	D
12	17	Oklahoma	1.55	1.62	D
9	18	N. Carolina	1.60	1.57	F
11	19	Maine	1.59	1.52	F
31	20	Georgia	1.24	1.50	F
20	21	Alaska	1.42	1.48	F
18	22	Alabama	1.42	1.48	F
25	23	N. Mexico	1.36	1.47	F
30	24	Colorado	1.25	1.46	F
14	25	Tennessee	1.52	1.44	F
32	26	Hawaii	1.21	1.40	F
27	27	Puerto Rico	1.29	1.37	F
3	28	Wyoming	2.25	1.37	F
19	29	S. Carolina	1.42	1.34	F
26	30	Wisconsin	1.30	1.34	F
33	31	Kansas	1.21	1.33	F
24	32	W. Virginia	1.38	1.30	F
34	33	Virginia	1.20	1.24	F
37	34	Pennsylvania	1.09	1.22	F
41	35	Michigan	1.05	1.21	F
29	36	Mississippi	1.26	1.19	F
42	37	Indiana	1.03	1.19	F
23	38	Utah	1.38	1.18	F
43	39	Connecticut	1.01	1.13	F
28	40	Delaware	1.27	1.13	F
44	41	California	0.97	1.09	F
35	42	Arizona	1.12	1.09	F
38	43	Nevada	1.08	1.02	F
40	44	Missoun	1.05	1.01	F
45	45	Louisiana	0.92	1.00	F
51	46	New York	0.73	0.98	F
50	47	Maryland	0.81	0.95	F
48	48	Florida	0.84	0.95	F
46	49	Rhode Island	0.88	0.94	F
49	50	Illinois	0.81	0.86	F
47	51	D.C.	0.86	0.65	F
52	52	N. Jersey	0.58	0.57	F

outmoded formula which inaccurately represented its educational environments. Idaho stays in the top five, moving from fourth to third in rank. Texas moved up from 39th to second; Montana from 17th to fourth; Kentucky from eighth to fifth. Several other states moved up in rank by eight or more steps, including Washington, Oregon, North Dakota, Ohio and Georgia. Wyoming experienced the greatest drop in rank, moving from third to 28th. A state official was unable to explain this change, stating there has to be a problem with the data.

Report Card Grades

The grades for each state in Table 5 are based on The Arc's interpretation of the federal data. The same grading system that was used for the first report card in 1992 is used for this latest report card. States were graded in terms of how extensively they provide an inclusive education program for children with mental retardation, with placement in the regular classroom carrying the most weight and placement in a separate school or residential facility carrying no weight. Grades were determined by reviewing each state's inclusion score and its record of regular class placements. The range for each grade is as follows: A = 3.51 - 4.00; B = 3.01 - 3.50; C = 2.51 - 3.00; D = 1.61 - 2.50; F = 0.00 - 1.60. Grades are assigned as follows in 1995:

- Vermont with a score of 3.29 far outranks the rest of the states and earns a "B." It placed 75 percent of its students with mental retardation in regular classrooms in 1992-93.
- No other state scored in the range of 2.51 to 3.00; thus, no "Cs" are awarded.
- Sixteen states scored between 1.61 to 2.50 and are assigned "Ds." (Only 6 earned that grade in 1992.)
- The remaining states are assigned "Fs." All score below 1.61.
- The bottom five states, those placing children with mental retardation in the least inclusive settings, are New Jersey, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Rhode Island and Florida. These are relegated to the "Hall of Shame," because in addition to having the lowest inclusion scores, these five states are found in the worst 10 list for least use of regular classroom and resource rooms.

Discussion

Overview of Findings

Once again, the grades are in and there is both good news and bad news. The good news is that some states have clearly made great strides in placing children with mental retardation in more inclusive settings. Vermont heads the list with 75 percent in regular classrooms. Other states with 20-25 percent in regular classrooms include Montana, Texas, Idaho, New Hampshire and Massachusetts. Following these states are eight more which placed 10 to 20 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms: Oregon, Nebraska, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Kentucky and North Carolina.

While 14 states increased the percentage of children in regular classrooms by more than 5 percent, the bad news is that the average increase in percentage of children with mental retardation placed in regular classrooms was less than 1 percentage point (0.4%) for the country from 1989-90 to 1992-93. Sixteen states actually declined in percentage of children with mental retardation placed in the regular classroom. The increase for children with all other disabilities was almost 9 percentage points. These data strongly suggest that children with mental retardation in most states are not placed based on the assumption that the regular classroom should be the first consideration. While the use of the resource room increased by about 7 percentage points for children with mental retardation, in many schools a resource room placement offers little opportunity for inclusive experiences. Sixty-six percent of children with mental retardation still remain in totally segregated settings, compared with 24 percent of children with all other disabilities.

A major conclusion is that in most of the nation's schools a child with mental retardation will not be afforded the opportunity to receive an education in the least restrictive environment with appropriate and individualized supplementary aids and services. There are a number of possible explanations for this. One is a belief on the part of school officials that having a cognitive disability automatically precludes being able to function in a regular classroom. Thus, this setting is never considered as a possibility for children with mental retardation. It is possible that some children with

mild mental retardation are being relabeled learning disabled, placed in regular classrooms and, therefore, not counted in the population of children with mental retardation. The number of children counted as having mental retardation has been declining annually, while the number of those with learning disabilities is growing. Finally, limitations in the data collected by states may mask the true placement of children with mental retardation. In 1992-93, South Dakota indicated its increase in regular class placements and decrease in resource room placements were a result of the state collecting placement data in terms of actual location where children were served and not as a function of the amount of special education services received.

Limitations of Data

Although the use of this federal data has sometimes been criticized because of concerns about its accuracy, it is reported to the United States Congress by the U.S. Department of Education after being collected and reported annually by all states. Therefore, it provides a useful basis for examining educational settings for children with mental retardation. Among the concerns is that state education agencies are dependent on local education agencies for accurate reporting of the data which means that categories of placements defined in terms of time spent in special education could be subject to different interpretations by various school districts. Massachusetts, for example, acknowledged problems with its collection system and resolved them for 1992-93. This resulted in 38 percent fewer children placed in regular classes. Other states have worked to improve their data collection systems as well, and some report that they have much more faith in the accuracy of their current data than in years past. However, there is uncertainty about the accuracy of the 1992-93 data for Texas and Wyoming. Texas shows a large positive change; Wyoming shows a large negative change.

Because the data reported is aggregated across all schools in a state, pockets of excellence are hidden. A state that ranks poorly on inclusion could still have individual schools and classrooms where model inclusion is taking place. However, most of the states at the bottom of the list include so few students in regular classes (14

out of 4976 in New Jersey) that there may not be more than an isolated student in a school who is included.

Quality of Education Received by Children with Mental Retardation

The Arc acknowledges that simply being placed in a regular classroom does not ensure that children with mental retardation receive an appropriate education. Children's individual needs must not be ignored. The necessary services must be provided within the regular schools to meet their individualized education program requirements. Some schools have been accused of "dumping" children; that is, placing them in a regular classroom without proper supports and supplementary services and without ensuring the regular classroom teacher is prepared to include them in the mainstream of classroom activities. However, in those schools and those classrooms where there is true commitment to inclusion, children with mental retardation are benefiting tremendously, as are their peers who do not have disabilities.

With these data revealing so few children with mental retardation receiving their education in a regular classroom, failure to even be considered for placement in a regular classroom would appear to be a far bigger problem for them than "dumping." They are clearly not even getting a foot in the regular classroom door. In the past, the criticism has been that children with mental retardation are too disabled to benefit from the regular classroom. With Vermont educating 75 percent of these students in regular classrooms and with the increase in knowledge of inclusive education practices, this argument has no weight. The National Council on Disability reports, "Thousands of students with all types of disabilities, including those with the most severe levels of disability, are being well supported--and are thriving--in full-time regular class placements across the country every day. Clearly, we have gone beyond the point where arguments can be effectively made that some students simply cannot be served in integrated placements because of the nature or severity of their disabilities (National Council on Disabilities, 1995, p. 95)."

The Arc's Call to Action

Twenty years after the passage of Public Law 94-142 requiring placement in the least restrictive environment, many states still have not initiated any leadership in developing more inclusive options for children with mental retardation. Schools routinely place children in segregated programs with virtually no consideration of less restrictive placements. In fact, state agencies continue to reward this noncompliance in many parts of the country by providing financial incentives for segregated placements (National Council on Disability, 1995).

Other barriers described by the National Council on Disability include the attitudes of professionals in education who resist inclusion, professionals who lack appropriate training, physical integration without true inclusion, IDEA's continuum requirement which even includes institutions and the federal government's failure to enforce the law.

In 1992, The Arc called on the federal government, state governments and advocacy organizations, including chapters of The Arc to initiate or enhance efforts to achieve inclusion of children with mental retardation in the nation's schools by the Year 2000. The Arc renews this call to action in 1995 with the following new and reiterated recommendations:

The Public Education System

The Arc calls for action by policymakers and administrators at all levels of public education:

The Federal Government

- In the reauthorizaton of IDEA later this year, The Arc calls on Congress to avoid enacting amendments which would make inclusion more difficult for schools to implement. One issue concerns discipline and removing disruptive students from the classroom. As the law now stands, children with disabilities can only be removed from the classroom for up to 10 days if the misconduct is a manifestation of their disability, unless they bring firearms to school. In that case, a 45 day interim change of placement may be made. If schools are allowed to expel students with disabilities for

behaviors related to their disabilities, the nation will revert to the status before P. L. 94-142 was enacted -- many children totally excluded from receiving a public education. The Arc is also concerned about proposals to eliminate categories of disability, for without the identification of children with mental retardation, it will be difficult to monitor and hold states accountable for their education programs and placements of these children.

- The Congress must insist on and the administration must fulfill its statutory responsibility to aggressively enforce the law. To date, no state has failed to receive funds because it did not comply with P.L. 94-142, or its successor, IDEA. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) must greatly improve its monitoring efforts and enforcement of states' compliance with the least restrictive environment requirements of the law.

- While The Arc recognizes the importance of the efforts now being supported by the federal government to facilitate inclusion, much more needs to be done. Especially important is for OSEP to address preservice and inservice training. programs to ensure all school personnel are prepared to work in inclusive classroom environments.

State Government

- As required by federal and state law as well, all states that receive funds under IDEA must ensure that all local education agencies are in compliance with IDEA or they risk losing the federal financial assistance. Consequently, state education agencies like their federal counterparts have an obligation to engage in aggressive monitoring and provide assistance to school districts to achieve inclusion. States must also examine their funding formulas for special education and remove barriers to inclusive education.

- Since licensing teachers, administrators and related services personnel is a state responsibility, existing requirements should be enhanced to ensure that all personnel receiving credit as a result of pre or inservice training will have been trained to practice their specialty for all children in inclusive settings.

Local School Systems

- Each local education agency should thoroughly review its policies and practices regarding the least restrictive environment. The data clearly show that most are not providing an inclusive education for children with mental retardation designed to prepare them for participation in a diverse society.
- Local education agencies should commit to providing inservice training for all school personnel to educate them about inclusive programs for children with mental retardation and other disabilities.
- Local education agencies must take action to implement policies and practices that support inclusive education.

Chapters of The Arc

The Arc calls on its 1100 chapters across the nation to work together to ensure that the children in their states and communities receive their education in inclusive settings.

- Local chapters of The Arc should work with their local school systems to celebrate the 20th anniversary of IDEA.
- Chapters should present this report to their state legislature and education agency officials, local boards of education and local school administrators and to parent/teacher and other organizations urging them to move toward inclusion of all students. Using this data can be the centerpoint of an ongoing campaign of chapters to achieve the Year 2000 target.
- Chapters should discover, celebrate and acknowledge those schools, classrooms and professionals who properly accomplish inclusion of children with mental retardation.
- Chapters must insist that by 2000 the antiquated and ineffective system of separate schools and facilities is totally eliminated.
- In the best tradition of The Arc, chapters must aggressively assist parents to advocate for inclusive education, including those who have children entering school, those already receiving special education and those whose children have left

school but recognize the future need. Parents must be trained to be informed consumers in order to advocate for revision in education policy to bring about inclusion and to join advisory councils, task forces, etc. to advocate for change in their schools. Chapters can also train and support parents to participate effectively in the IEP process to achieve the regular classroom placement for their own child and to monitor local schools' practices regarding inclusion.

Conclusion

Three years after its first report card and on the 20th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, The Arc is extremely disappointed in the progress being made to implement the least restrictive environment requirements of the Act. Very few children with mental retardation received their education in regular classroom settings in 1992-93. It is disheartening to note that the percentage of children with mental retardation in these settings, 7.1 percent, was exceeded by the percentage in totally separate day and residential schools, 8.7 percent. In addition, 56.8 percent of children with mental retardation were educated in separate classrooms, most presumably with few opportunities to interact with peers who did not have disabilities.

It appears that The Arc's hope that 50 percent of children with mental retardation will be educated in regular classrooms by 1995 will be met by one state, Vermont. Given Vermont's example, The Arc's call for inclusion of all children with mental retardation by the year 2000 remains a realistic goal. What is needed is the removal of barriers that still stand in the way of implementing inclusive programs and the will on the part of school officials to achieve this mandate for all children with mental retardation and related disabilities.

REFERENCES

Baker, E.T., Wang, M.C. & Walberg, H.J. (1994). The effects of inclusion on learning. Educational Leadership, 52, (4), 33-35.

Burello, L.C. & Wright, P.T. (Eds.) (Winter, 1993). Strategies for inclusion of behaviorally challenged students. The Principal Letters, 10.

Christmas, O.L. (1992). The 1992 Michigan non-mandated aide pilot project. Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education.

Davis, S. (1992). Report Card to the Nation on Inclusion in Education of Students with Mental Retardation. Arlington, TX: The Arc, National Headquarters.

Ferguson, D.L., Meyer, G., Jeanchild, L., Juniper, L., & Zingo, J. (1992). Figuring out what to do with the grownups: How teachers make inclusion "work" for students with disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 17 (4), 218-226.

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S., Cloniger, C., & Dennis, R. (1992). My child has a classmate with severe disabilities: What parents of nondisabled children think about full inclusion. Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 20 (2), 1-12.

Janney, R.E., Snell, M.E., Beers, M.K., & Raynes, M. (1995). Integrating Students with Moderate and Severe Disabilities into General Education Classes. Exceptional Children, 61 (5), 425-439.

Lipsky, D.K. & Gartner, A. (1994). Inclusion: What It Is, What It's Not and Why It Matters. Exceptional Parent.

Marwell, B.E. (1990). Integration of students with mental retardation. Madison, WI: Madison Public Schools.

McDonnell, A., McDonnell, J., Hardman, M., & McCone, G. (1991)., Educating students with severe disabilities in their neighborhood school: The Utah elementary model. Remedial and Special Education, 12 (6), 34-45.

National Council on Disability. (1995). Improving the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Making Schools Work for All of America's Children. Author.

Staub, D. & Peck, C.A. (1994). What are the outcomes for nondisabled students? Educational Leadership. 52 (4), 36-40.

The Arc (1994). Education. Position Statements of The Arc. Arlington, TX: Author.

U. S. Department of Education (1992). Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Education (1995) Seventeenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

The Arc of the United States
500 E. Border St., Suite 300
Arlington, Texas 76010
(817) 261-6003; (817) 277-0553 TDD
Email: thearc@metronet.com

October 1995

Table AB2

Number of Children Age 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B and Chapter 1 of ESEA (SOP) During the 1992-93 School Year

MENTAL RETARDATION

NUMBER

STATE	REGULAR CLASS	RESOURCE ROOM	SEPARATE CLASS	PUBLIC SEPARATE FACILITY	PRIVATE SEPARATE FACILITY	PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	HOMEBOUND HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT
ALABAMA	2,115	6,041	15,771	589	32	1	10	51
ALASKA	35	125	297	0	7	0	0	0
ARIZONA	73	671	4,104	289	117	1	1	12
ARKANSAS	906	4,591	3,882	44	259	175	93	53
CALIFORNIA	692	2,497	20,332	1,762	354	0	24	831
COLORADO	113	934	1,646	13	9	7	1	2
CONNECTICUT	110	597	2,405	292	140	1	23	3
DELAWARE	98	288	622	395	0	0	3	5
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17	45	584	330	154	2	3	0
FLORIDA	592	1,198	15,744	3,969	128	23	2	26
GEORGIA	2,005	6,251	15,083	215	16	179	13	60
HAWAII	102	353	1,179	0	0	0	0	7
IDAHO	633	979	957	76	10	7	0	5
ILLINOIS	174	818	17,328	2,362	1,789	174	213	13
INDIANA	1,171	1,222	15,482	1,021	1	28	46	14
IOWA	87	6,920	3,481	286	0	12	9	14
KANSAS	270	1,238	3,472	192	33	39	46	6
KENTUCKY	2,290	9,710	5,203	239	2	33	2	143
LOUISIANA	176	666	9,231	629	82	441	24	50
MAINE	120	568	858	25	50	0	5	3
MARYLAND	263	415	3,113	1,317	103	1	67	11
MASSACHUSETTS	2,681	2,894	6,386	206	390	0	101	50
MICHIGAN	1,220	3,285	10,860	3,020	.	9	13	16
MINNESOTA	1,496	4,125	3,211	806	52	68	18	26
MISSISSIPPI	199	592	4,279	125	11	32	8	33
MISSOURI	372	2,044	8,230	2,903	50	28	10	59
MONTANA	293	365	522	1	0	2	2	3
NEBRASKA	758	1,673	1,810	132	16	38	6	9
NEVADA	23	273	886	318	1	0	0	5
NEW HAMPSHIRE	108	145	419	41	35	1	22	1
NEW JERSEY	14	92	2,810	1,691	530	26	13	14
NEW MEXICO	179	368	1,385	0	0	1	1	4
NEW YORK	1,269	1,421	10,220	4,956	456	28	97	59
NORTH CAROLINA	2,195	6,887	9,996	1,241	144	44	175	57
NORTH DAKOTA	214	300	736	10	5	10	16	10
OHIO	1,111	25,446	16,194	936	47	206	.	86
OKLAHOMA	1,130	3,943	6,304	140	6	11	9	31
OREGON	651	870	2,061	50	12	4	4	13
PENNSYLVANIA	810	6,491	18,853	2,305	134	117	58	32
PUERTO RICO	229	4,836	6,668	570	123	70	50	156
RHODE ISLAND	21	38	805	0	136	0	21	9
SOUTH CAROLINA	525	4,122	8,470	654	1	161	8	61
SOUTH DAKOTA	224	589	455	24	42	11	52	2
TENNESSEE	819	3,761	7,230	310	177	104	9	60
TEXAS	5,814	10,647	5,820	262	15	717	2	169
UTAH	126	509	2,531	237	0	10	0	3
VERMONT	980	75	227	9	8	1	8	6
VIRGINIA	319	2,698	9,024	448	26	125	31	36
WASHINGTON	1,216	2,397	3,669	36	10	3	2	6
WEST VIRGINIA	80	2,234	4,843	159	85	7	0	36
WISCONSIN	142	1,237	2,782	183	0	15	0	7
WYOMING	31	258	163	11	2	57	16	1
AMERICAN SAMOA	41	17	0	25	0	0	0	0
GUAM	10	62	89	4	0	0	0	0
NORTHERN MARIANAS	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PALAU	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	3	371	13	0	0	3	5
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	30	204	74	0	0	0	51	0
U.S. AND OUTLYING AREAS	37,466	141,028	298,957	35,871	5,799	3,119	1,375	2,770
50 STATES, D.C., & P.R.	37,371	140,742	298,423	35,829	5,799	3,119	1,321	2,765

PLEASE SEE DATA NOTES FOR AN EXPLANATION OF INDIVIDUAL STATE DIFFERENCES.

DATA AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1994.

SOURCE: AR_AB2.SPW

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table AB2

Percentage of Children Age 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B and Chapter 1 of ESEA (SOP) During the 1992-93 School Year

MENTAL RETARDATION

STATE	REGULAR CLASS	RESOURCE ROOM	SEPARATE CLASS	PUBLIC SEPARATE FACILITY	PRIVATE SEPARATE FACILITY	PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	HOMEBOUND HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT
	PERCENTAGE							
ALABAMA	0.99	24.99	64.08	2.39	0.13	0.00	0.04	0.21
ALASKA	7.96	26.96	64.01	.	1.51	.	.	.
ARIZONA	5.39	12.74	77.90	5.49	2.22	0.02	0.02	0.23
ARKANSAS	9.06	45.90	38.81	0.44	2.59	1.75	0.93	0.53
CALIFORNIA	2.61	9.43	76.75	6.65	1.34	.	0.09	3.14
COLORADO	4.13	34.26	60.38	0.48	0.29	0.26	0.11	0.07
CONNECTICUT	3.08	16.72	67.35	8.18	3.92	0.03	0.64	0.08
DELAWARE	6.99	20.41	44.08	27.99	.	.	0.21	0.35
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	5.90	3.96	51.45	29.07	13.57	0.18	0.26	.
FLORIDA	2.73	5.93	72.61	18.31	0.59	0.11	0.01	0.12
GEORGIA	8.64	26.33	63.19	0.91	0.07	0.75	0.05	0.25
HAWAII	6.23	21.93	71.85	.	.	.	.	0.43
IDAHO	23.73	36.71	35.88	2.85	0.37	0.26	.	0.19
ILLINOIS	0.76	3.18	75.76	10.33	7.82	0.76	0.93	0.06
INDIANA	6.13	6.40	81.66	5.34	0.01	0.15	0.24	0.07
IOWA	0.90	64.02	32.20	2.65	.	0.11	0.08	0.13
KANSAS	5.10	23.38	65.56	3.63	0.32	0.74	0.87	0.11
KENTUCKY	13.00	55.10	29.53	1.36	0.01	0.19	0.01	0.81
LOUISIANA	1.96	9.89	81.70	5.57	0.73	3.90	0.21	0.44
MAINE	7.37	34.87	52.67	1.53	3.07	.	0.31	0.18
MARYLAND	4.99	7.87	59.06	24.99	1.95	0.04	0.89	0.21
MASSACHUSETTS	21.10	22.77	50.25	1.62	3.07	.	0.79	0.39
MICHIGAN	6.62	17.83	58.95	16.39	.	0.05	0.07	0.08
MINNESOTA	19.26	42.08	32.76	8.22	0.53	0.69	0.18	0.27
MISSISSIPPI	3.77	11.21	81.06	2.37	0.21	0.61	0.15	0.63
MISSOURI	2.72	14.92	60.09	21.20	0.37	0.20	0.07	0.43
MONTANA	24.66	30.72	43.94	0.08	.	0.17	0.17	0.25
NEBRASKA	17.06	37.68	40.75	2.97	0.36	0.86	0.14	0.20
NEVADA	1.79	21.26	51.71	24.77	0.08	.	.	0.39
NEW HAMPSHIRE	22.97	17.02	49.18	4.81	4.11	0.12	2.58	0.12
NEW JERSEY	0.29	1.86	52.30	33.89	10.62	0.52	0.26	0.28
NEW MEXICO	9.24	18.99	71.47	.	.	0.05	0.05	0.21
NEW YORK	0.86	7.68	55.23	26.78	2.46	0.15	0.52	0.32
NORTH CAROLINA	10.58	33.21	48.20	5.98	0.69	0.21	0.84	0.27
NORTH DAKOTA	16.43	23.02	56.64	0.77	0.38	0.77	1.23	0.77
OHIO	2.93	57.80	36.78	2.13	0.11	0.47	.	0.20
OKLAHOMA	9.76	34.07	54.47	1.21	0.05	0.10	0.08	0.27
OREGON	17.76	23.76	55.69	1.36	0.33	0.11	0.11	0.90
PENNSYLVANIA	3.81	22.96	65.46	8.00	0.47	0.41	0.20	0.11
PUERTO RICO	1.77	37.62	51.75	4.41	0.95	0.54	0.39	2.77
RHODE ISLAND	3.03	3.68	78.00	.	13.18	.	2.23	0.87
SOUTH CAROLINA	3.78	29.46	60.49	4.67	0.01	1.15	0.06	0.44
SOUTH DAKOTA	18.01	42.10	32.52	1.72	3.00	0.79	3.72	0.14
TENNESSEE	6.96	30.02	57.70	2.47	1.41	1.47	0.07	0.32
TEXAS	24.59	49.03	24.61	1.11	0.06	3.03	0.01	1.56
UTAH	3.08	14.87	73.92	6.92	.	0.53	.	0.09
VERMONT	70.70	9.72	17.70	0.69	0.61	0.08	0.61	0.30
VIRGINIA	2.91	21.23	71.00	3.53	0.20	0.98	0.26	0.28
WASHINGTON	16.97	32.68	49.99	0.49	0.14	0.04	0.03	0.08
WEST VIRGINIA	1.07	30.02	65.08	2.14	1.14	0.09	.	0.46
WISCONSIN	3.23	28.33	63.72	4.19	.	0.34	.	0.16
WYOMING	4.33	39.98	47.84	1.53	0.28	7.95	1.95	0.14
AMERICAN SAMOA	49.49	20.48	.	30.12	.	.	.	.
GUAM	9.09	37.98	53.94	2.42	.	.	.	.
NORTHERN MARIANAS	100.00	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
PALAU	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
VIRGIN ISLANDS	.	0.76	93.92	3.29	.	.	0.76	1.27
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	9.16	56.82	20.61	.	.	.	14.21	.
U.S. AND OUTLYING AREAS	7.13	26.79	56.79	6.81	1.10	0.59	0.26	0.53
50 STATES, D.C., & P.R.	7.11	26.79	56.80	6.82	1.10	0.59	0.25	0.53

PLEASE SEE DATA NOTES FOR AN EXPLANATION OF INDIVIDUAL STATE DIFFERENCES.

DATA AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1994.

SOURCE: AB_AB2.SPW

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").